

Inside Canada by Jerry Pyenson

'Strength needed to counter Soviets'

A Canadian military strategist supports the development of anti-missile beam-weapon defensive systems.

The following is an interview by *EIR* of Col. Brian MacDonald, executive director of the the Canadian Institute for Strategic Studies (CISS), on Western strategy. Correspondent Gerald Pyenson talked with Colonel MacDonald on Sept. 9. CISS is a private think tank that advises the Ottawa government.

EIR: How do you view the Soviets' downing of the Korean airliner?

MacDonald: I guess our view would be that that particular action is not inconsistent with the sort of actions that the Soviet Union has carried out before. A country that can put 110,000 combat troops into Afghanistan, and essentially deport 4½ million refugees from that country, a country that has been caught using chemical and biological weapons in Southeast Asia, is a country that can quite easily put a missile into an unarmed passenger jet. . . .

EIR: What should the Western response be?

MacDonald: I think that the particular responses that have been chosen have been very moderate responses, and have certainly given an advantage to the United States in the ongoing propaganda battle between East and West, particularly with respect to the internal publics of the Western democracies. It would seem for example that the barbarity of the Soviet actions, coupled with the very moderate response from the West and the increasing public revulsion, has enhanced the prospects for improved

defense financial allocations in the West, and it has damaged the political credibility of the disarmament movements.

EIR: That doesn't seem to have been caught up to in the press here in Canada. For instance, the *Montreal Gazette* today had an editorial calling for the United States to adopt Andropov's policy of banning "killer satellites." We are looking at this move by Andropov as part of an attempt to obstruct the beam-weapons policy of President Reagan, and we think that the development of those weapons would be extremely important for the Western Alliance.

MacDonald: Our view would be consistent with that.

EIR: Do you think that Canada is going to eventually support the beam-weapons policy?

MacDonald: We think that Canada should be prepared to take a position in the development of all aspects of space technology. One of our great concerns is that Canada may become increasingly irrelevant to its own defense. We have the participation in NORAD [North Atlantic Air Defense] and to this point, on a financial basis, have paid a sum that is appropriate to our economic power. But we certainly, at this stage, do not seem to be taking any great position with respect to the development of space technology, and what is happening, of course, is that in NORAD the Canadian officers are gradually being frozen out of participation in the activities of aero-

space command. We view that as being, in the long run, damaging to Canadian interests.

EIR: Do you view the Soviets as in a mode of preparing for confrontation? . . .

MacDonald: My view is, of course, that the Soviet Union is an expansionary superpower, that its world aims have not changed, that the doctrine of Marxist expansion is as firmly held to at this point as it ever was; that they are, however, strategically extremely cautious, and I suppose, if one wanted to look at what their de facto—I hate to use the term strategic "tactics"—one could almost talk of their loose-change approach of pouncing upon an area of weakness and attempting to incorporate that into their sphere of influence. But where there is a strong resistance on the part of the West, they cautiously watch that particular aspect. The pattern, in my view, has consistently been to move against weakness, and to stay pat in the face of strength.

EIR: As a Canadian, how do you assess President Reagan's public response to the KAL shootdown?

MacDonald: I viewed the speech as being extraordinarily moderate and sensible. There was the opportunity given to the Soviet Union to explain its actions, to take steps that would be consistent with the actions of a civilized state, and there was the employment of symbolic sanctions to indicate the West's disapproval. There was no backing away from arms-control negotiations, but the one caveat I would insert is that we must be very cautious that the arms-control agreement is not a disadvantageous agreement. Beyond that, the emphasis upon adequate commitment of financial resources to defense is something that is very, very sensible, and we have been urging such a policy for the Canadian economy for some time.